arXiv:math/0502410v2 [math.CT] 28 Feb 2005

Lifted closure operators [*]

Gábor Lukács [†]

February 1, 2008

Abstract

In this paper, we study the properties of closure operators obtained as initial lifts along a reflector, and compactness with respect to them in particular. Applications in the areas of topology, topological groups and topological $*$-algebras are presented.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ are finitely-complete categories with proper $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ and $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{N})$ factorization systems, respectively (cf. [17, 7.2]). For $X \in \mathfrak{X}$, the class $\mathcal{M}/X$ of subobjects of X is preordered by the relation $m \leq n \Longleftrightarrow (\exists j)\, m = nj$, and denoted by $\operatorname{sub} X$.

A *closure operator* with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ is a family $c = (c_X)_{X\in\mathfrak{X}}$ of maps $c_X \colon \operatorname{sub} X \to \operatorname{sub} X$ such that $m \leq c_X(m)$, $c_X(m) \leq c_X(n)$ if $m \leq n$, and $f(c_X(m)) \leq c_Y(f(m))$ for all $f \colon X \to Y$ in $\mathfrak{X}$ and $m, n \in \operatorname{sub} X$ (cf. [5]). The term "closure operator" has been used for almost a century in various meanings in the context of categories of topological spaces and lattices. However, this (general) categorical notion of closure operators was invented by Dikranjan and Giuli [6], and was further developed by Dikranjan, Giuli and Tholen in [8]. Following [7], an object $X \in \mathfrak{X}$ is said to be c-*compact* if for every $Y \in \mathfrak{X}$, the projection $\pi_Y \colon X \times Y \to Y$ is c-*preserving*, or in other words, if $\pi_Y(c_X(m)) = c_Y(\pi_Y(m))$ for every $m \in \operatorname{sub}(X \times Y)$.

If $F \dashv U \colon \mathfrak{A} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ is an adjunction with unit η, and c is a closure operator of $\mathfrak{A}$ with respect to $\mathcal{N}$, then one defines the F-*initial lift of* c as

$$c^{\eta}_X(m) := \eta_X^{-1}(U c_{FX}(Fm)) \tag{1}$$

for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}, m \in \operatorname{sub}(X)$ (cf. [5, 5.13]). The morphism Fm need not belong to $\mathcal{N}$, so in order to ensure that (1) is defined, one extends the notion of closure as $c_{FX}(Fm) = c_{FX}((Fm)(1_{FM}))$ (cf. [5, 5.7]).

In this paper, we study the special case of this construction where $\mathfrak{A}$ is a reflective subcategory of $\mathfrak{X}$ with reflector $F = R$ and reflection $\eta = \rho$. We provide a characterization of c^{ρ}-compact objects in $\mathfrak{X}$ under certain conditions (Theorem 2.7), and applications in the areas of topology, topological groups and topological $*$-algebras are presented We also investigate the categorical properties of c that are inherited by c^{ρ}.

---

[*] 2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 18A32 54B30 (18B30 22A05 46K10)

[†] I gratefully acknowledge the generous financial support received from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, the Killam Trusts, and Dalhousie University that enabled me to do this research.

The paper is structured as follows: We start off with an investigation of the properties of lifted closure operators in section 2, with an emphasis on compactness with respect to them. In section 3, we show that the notion of w-compactness (introduced by T. Ishii in [23]) is equivalent to being compact with respect to the initial lift of the Kuratowski closure operator on Tych (Tychonoff spaces and their continuous maps) along the Tychonoff functor $\tau\colon \mathsf{Top} \longrightarrow \mathsf{Tych}$. In section 4, the Bohr-closure c_b for topological groups is presented as the initial lift of the Kuratowski closure along the Bohr-compactification, and Theorem 2.7 is used to characterize c_b-compactness. The Bohr-closure also turns out to be a convenient example to show that certain properties are not preserved by the initial lift along a reflection. Finally, in section 5, we prove that the $*$-representation topology on topological $*$-algebras is an initial lift of the Kuratowski closure along a suitable reflection.

2. PROPERTIES OF LIFTED CLOSURE OPERATORS

In this section, we present results of a positive nature, in other words, properties that carry over from c to c^ρ. Counterexamples, which show that certain properties are not inherited by c^ρ, appear later on.

As stated in the Introduction, $\mathfrak{A}$ is a reflective subcategory of $\mathfrak{X}$ with reflector R and reflection ρ, and thus (1) becomes

$$c^\rho_X(m) := \rho_X^{-1}(c_{RX}(Rm)). \tag{2}$$

It can be shown that $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and $R\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ (cf. [5, 5.13]), so in order to avoid confusion, we put $\operatorname{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} A$ for the class of subobjects of $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{N}/A$) when necessary.

It was observed by Baron [1] that every reflection decomposes into two epireflections. Using the same idea, we factorize R as an $\mathcal{E}$-reflector followed by an epireflector: For every $X \in \mathfrak{X}$, one can factorize the reflection as $\rho_X = \rho_X^{\mathcal{M}} \rho_X^{\mathcal{E}}$, where $\rho_X^{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\rho_X^{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{M}$, and put $R^{\mathcal{E}}X$ for the codomain of $\rho^{\mathcal{E}}_X$. Obviously, $R^{\mathcal{E}}X$ belongs to $\mathfrak{B} = \{S \in \mathfrak{X} \mid \rho_S \in \mathcal{M}\}$, and $\mathfrak{B}$ is the $\mathcal{E}$-reflective hull of $\mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathfrak{X}$ (naturally, with reflector $R^{\mathcal{E}}$ and reflection $\rho^{\mathcal{E}}$). Furthermore, $\rho^{\mathcal{M}}$ is an epimorphism in $\mathfrak{B}$, so $\mathfrak{A}$ is an epireflective subcategory of $\mathfrak{B}$ with reflector $R^{\mathcal{M}} = R\big|_{\mathfrak{B}}$, and $R = R^{\mathcal{M}} R^{\mathcal{E}}$. Since $\mathfrak{B}$ is $\mathcal{E}$-reflective, it inherits from $\mathfrak{X}$ a proper $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{B}})$-factorization system, where $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}} = \mathcal{E} \cap \operatorname{mor} \mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{B}} = \mathcal{M} \cap \operatorname{mor} \mathfrak{B}$.

Remark 2.1. One says that $m \in \operatorname{sub} X$ is *c-dense* if $c_X(m) = 1_X$. Every $S \in \mathfrak{B}$ is c^ρ-dense in its reflection RS, because $c^\rho_{RS}(\rho_S) = \rho^{-1}_{RS}(c_{RS}(R\rho_S)) = c_{RS}(1_{RS}) = 1_{RS}$. Thus, for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}$, ρ_X has a c^ρ-dense image in RX.

Proposition 2.2. *Let c be a closure operator on $\mathfrak{A}$. For every $X \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $m \in \operatorname{sub} X$, the class $\mathcal{C} := \{\rho_X^{-1}(c_{RX}(n)) \mid m \leq \rho_X^{-1}(n), n \in \operatorname{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}}\}$ has an infimum and $\bigwedge \mathcal{C} = c^\rho_X(m)$.*

Proof. Clearly, $c^\rho_X(m) \in \mathcal{C}$, because $\rho_X(m) \leq (Rm)(1_{RM})$. On the other hand, if $m \leq \rho_X^{-1}(n)$ for $n \in \operatorname{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}}$, then $\rho_X(m) \leq n$, and thus $(Rm)(1_{RM}) \leq n$; in particular, $c_{RX}(Rm) \leq c_{RX}(n)$. Therefore, $c^\rho_X(m)$ is a lower bound to $\mathcal{C}$. $\square$

A closure operator c is *idempotent* if $c_A(c_A(m)) = c_A(m)$ for every $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $m \in \operatorname{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} A$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let c be a closure operator of $\mathfrak{A}$. If c is idempotent, then so is c^ρ.*

PROOF. Let $X \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $m \in \mathrm{sub}\, X$. Clearly, $(R\rho_X^{-1}(k))(1_{R(K\times_{RX}X)}) \leq k$ for every $k \in \mathrm{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} RX$, so for $k = c_{RX}(Rm)$, the image of $R\rho_X^{-1}(c_{RX}(Rm))$ is contained in $c_{RX}(Rm)$. Since c is idempotent, we obtain:

$$c^\rho_X(c^\rho_X(m)) = \rho_X^{-1}(c_{RX}(R\rho_X^{-1}(c_{RX}(Rm)))) \tag{3}$$

$$\leq \rho_X^{-1}(c_{RX}(c_{RX}(Rm))) = \rho_X^{-1}(c_{RX}(Rm))) = c^\rho_X(m). \tag{4}$$

Therefore, $c^\rho_X(m) = c^\rho_X(c^\rho_X(m))$, because c^ρ_X is extensive. ☐

One says that a closure operator c is (*finitely*) *productive* if for every (finite) family $\{A_i\}_{i\in I}$ of objects in $\mathfrak{A}$ and their subobjects $m_i \in \mathrm{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} A_i$, $c_{\prod\limits_{i\in I} A_i}(\prod m_i) = \prod\limits_{i\in I} c_{A_i}(m_i)$.

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is* (*finite*) *productive, and let c be a closure operator of $\mathfrak{A}$. If c is* (*finitely*) *productive and R preserves* (*finite*) *products, then c^ρ is* (*finitely*) *productive.*

PROOF. Let $\{X_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a (finite) family of objects in $\mathfrak{X}$, and let $m_i \in \mathrm{sub}\, X_i$ be their subobjects. Put $X = \prod\limits_{i\in I} X_i$ and $m = \prod\limits_{i\in I} m_i$. Since R preserves (finite) products, $\rho_X = \prod\limits_{i\in I} \rho_{X_i}$ and $Rm = \prod\limits_{i\in I} Rm_i$, and one has $(Rm)(1_{RM}) = \prod\limits_{i\in I}(Rm_i)(1_{RM_i})$, because $\mathcal{F}$ is (finitely) productive. Therefore, we obtain

$$c^\rho_X(m) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \rho_X^{-1}(c_{RX}(\prod_{i\in I} Rm_i)) = (\prod_{i\in I} \rho_{X_i})^{-1}(\prod_{i\in I} c_{RX_i}(Rm_i)) \tag{5}$$

$$= \prod_{i\in I} \rho_{X_i}^{-1}(c_{RX_i}(Rm_i)) = \prod_{i\in I} c^\rho_{X_i}(m_i), \tag{6}$$

because c is (finitely) productive, and limits interchange with each other. ☐

For $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, a subobject $m \in \mathrm{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} A$ is c-*closed* if $c_A(m) = m$. One says that A is c-*separated* (or c-*Hausdorff*) if the diagonal $\delta_A \colon A \longrightarrow A \times A$ is c-closed in A (cf. [3, 4.1]).

Proposition 2.5. *Let c be a a closure operator of $\mathfrak{A}$. For $X \in \mathfrak{X}$, suppose that* (a) *RX is c-separated and* (b) *$\rho_{X\times X} = \rho_X \times \rho_X$. Then X is c^ρ-separated if and only if ρ_X is a monomorphism.*

PROOF. Using the assumptions, one can easily see that

$$c^\rho_{X\times X}(\delta_X) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \rho^{-1}_{X\times X}(c_{R(X\times X)}(R\delta_X)) \overset{\text{(a)}}{=} (\rho_X \times \rho_X)^{-1}(c_{RX\times RX}(\delta_{RX})) \overset{\text{(b)}}{=} (\rho_X \times \rho_X)^{-1}(\delta_{RX}). \tag{7}$$

This simple computation shows that $c^\rho_{X\times X}(\delta_X)$ is precisely the kernelpair of ρ_X. ☐

We turn to characterizing the c^ρ-compact objects, and to that end, until the end of this section, $\mathcal{E}$ is assumed to be pullback stable.

Proposition 2.6. *Let c be a closure operator on $\mathfrak{A}$. If $X \in \mathfrak{X}$ is c^ρ-compact, then:*

(a) *$R^{\mathcal{E}}X$ is c^ρ-compact;*

(b) *if RX is c-separated, then $\rho_X \in \mathcal{E}$ and RX is c-compact.*

PROOF. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is pullback stable, the image of any c^ρ-compact object under a morphism is again c^ρ-compact (cf. [3, 5.2(3)]), and thus (a) follows. In order to show (b), notice that $R^{\mathcal{E}}X$ is c^ρ-closed in RX (cf. [3, 5.2(2)]), because RX is c-separated. On the other hand, $R^{\mathcal{E}}X$ is c^ρ-dense in RX (Remark 2.1), and therefore $R^{\mathcal{E}}X = RX$. ☐

For $X \in \mathfrak{X}$, we say that R *preserves products with* X if $\rho_{X\times Y} = \rho_X \times \rho_Y$ for every $Y \in \mathfrak{X}$.

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$. Let c be a closure operator of $\mathfrak{A}$, and let $X \in \mathfrak{X}$. If R preserves products with X, $\rho_X \in \mathcal{E}$, and RX is c-compact, then X is c^ρ-compact.*

Remark 2.8. The condition of $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$ implies that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq R\mathcal{E}$, and therefore $\mathcal{F} = R\mathcal{E}$ (cf. [5, 5.13]). Its role in the theorem is to ensure that the factorization of a morphism in $\mathfrak{A}$ coincides with its factorization in $\mathfrak{X}$.

In order to prove Theorem 2.7, a technical lemma is required. It is an easy consequence of the *Beck-Chevalley Property* (cf. [26, 3.8]), and thus its straightforward proof is omitted:

Lemma 2.9. *Let $X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathfrak{X}$, and let $e\colon X_1 \to X_2$ and $f\colon Y_1 \to Y_2$ be morphisms. Put $g = e\times f\colon X_1\times Y_1 \to X_2\times Y_2$. If $e \in \mathcal{E}$ (and $\mathcal{E}$ is pullback stable), then for every $n \in \operatorname{sub}(X_2\times Y_2)$, $\pi_{Y_1}(g^{-1}(n)) = f^{-1}(\pi_{Y_2}(n))$.* ☐

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.7. Let $Y \in \mathfrak{X}$. We show that $\pi_Y : X\times Y \to Y$ is c^ρ-preserving. To that end, let $m \in \operatorname{sub}(X\times Y)$. First, note that

$$\pi_{RY}((Rm)(1_{RM})) = R(\pi_Y(m))(1_{RN}), \tag{8}$$

where $\pi_Y(m)\colon N \to Y$. Indeed, $\pi_Y m = \pi_Y(m)e$, where $e \in \mathcal{E}$, so $R(\pi_Y m) = R(\pi_Y(m))Re$. Thus, $\pi_{RY}((Rm)(1_{RM})) = R(\pi_Y m)(1_{RM}) = R(\pi_Y(m))(Re(1_{RM})) = R(\pi_Y(m))(1_{RN})$, as $Re\colon RM \to RN$ belongs to $R\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}$ and R preserves products with X (so $R\pi_Y = \pi_{RY}$). By Lemma 2.9, $\pi_Y(\rho^{-1}_{X\times Y}(n)) = \rho^{-1}_Y(\pi_{RY}(n))$ for every $n \in \operatorname{sub}(RX\times RY)$, because $\rho_X \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\rho_{X\times Y} = \rho_X \times \rho_Y$. Thus, putting $n = c_{RX\times RY}(Rm)$ yields:

$$\pi_Y(c^\rho_{X\times Y}(m)) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \pi_Y(\rho^{-1}_{X\times Y}(c_{RX\times RY}(Rm))) = \rho^{-1}_Y(\pi_{RY}(c_{RX\times RY}(Rm))).$$

Since RX is c-compact, one has $c_{RY}(\pi_{RY}(k)) = \pi_{RY}(c_{RX\times RY}(k))$ for every $k \in \operatorname{sub}(RX\times RY)$. By letting $k = (Rm)(1_{RM})$ and then applying ρ^{-1}_Y to both sides, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^{-1}_Y(\pi_{RY}(c_{RX\times RY}(Rm))) &= \rho^{-1}_Y(c_{RY}(\pi_{RY}((Rm)(1_{RM}))))\\ &\overset{(8)}{=} \rho^{-1}_Y(c_{RY}(R(\pi_Y(m))(1_{RN}))) \overset{\text{def}}{=} c^\rho_Y(\pi_Y(m)).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $c^\rho_Y(\pi_Y(m)) = \pi_Y(c^\rho_{X\times Y}(m))$, as desired. ☐

Corollary 2.10. *Suppose that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M} \cap \operatorname{mor}\mathfrak{A}$ and that $\mathfrak{A}$ is $\mathcal{E}$-reflective in $\mathfrak{X}$. Let c be a closure operator of $\mathfrak{A}$, and let $X \in \mathfrak{X}$. If R preserves products with X, then X is c^ρ-compact if and only if RX is c-compact.*

PROOF. Since $\mathfrak{A}$ is $\mathcal{E}$-reflective in $\mathfrak{X}$, the $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{M})$-factorization system in $\mathfrak{X}$ restricts to a proper $(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{A}})$-factorization system in $\mathfrak{A}$, where $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{A}} = \mathcal{E} \cap \operatorname{mor} \mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{A}} = \mathcal{M} \cap \operatorname{mor} \mathfrak{A}$. Because of the "orthogonality" relation, $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ determine each other, and thus $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ implies $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{A}}$. So, the conditions of Theorem 2.7 are fulfilled, and therefore if RX is c-compact, then X is c^{ρ}-compact. On the other hand, by Proposition 2.6(a), if X is c^{ρ}-compact, then so is $R^{\mathcal{E}}X = RX$; hence, RX is c-compact, as desired. ☐

A combination of Theorem 2.7 and Proposition 2.6 yields:

Corollary 2.11. *Let c be a closure operator of $\mathfrak{A}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$ and every object in $\mathfrak{A}$ is c-separated. If $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is so that R preserves products with X, then X is c^{ρ}-compact if and only if $\rho_X \in \mathcal{E}$ and RX is c-compact.* ☐

The *discrete* closure operator s is defined as $s_A(m) = m$ for every $m \in \operatorname{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} A$ and $A \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Corollary 2.12. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$, and let $X \in \mathfrak{X}$. If R preserves products with X, then X is s^{ρ}-compact if and only if $\rho_X \in \mathcal{E}$.* ☐

3. APPLICATION I: THE TYCHONOFF FUNCTOR

Put $\mathbb{I}$ for the closed unit interval. For any $X \in \mathsf{Top}$ (the category of topological spaces and their continuous maps), the evaluation map $\Phi_X \colon X \longrightarrow \mathbb{I}^{C(X,\mathbb{I})}$, mapping $x \in X$ to $(f(x))_{f \in C(X,\mathbb{I})}$, is continuous. One sets $\tau X = \Phi_X(X)$, and τ is called the *Tychonoff functor*: It is the reflector of Tych (the full subcategory formed by the Tychonoff spaces) in Top.

Put $\mathfrak{X} = \mathsf{Top}$, $\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{Tych}$, $R = \tau$, and $\rho = \theta$. The category Top admits a proper $(\mathsf{Onto}, \mathsf{Embed})$-factorization system, and the reflection $\theta_X \colon X \longrightarrow \tau X$ is surjective (by definition) for every $X \in \mathsf{Top}$. Thus, by putting $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{A}}$, we arrive at the setting described in Corollary 2.10, because $\mathcal{E} = \mathsf{Onto}$ is obviously pullback stable. Therefore, for any closure operator c of Tych, if τ preserves products with $X \in \mathsf{Top}$, then X is c^{θ}-compact if and only if τX is c-compact. Here, we are interested in the case where $c = K$, the Kuratowski-closure. Since the K-compact spaces in Tych are precisely the compact ones (by the classical Kuratowski-Mrówka Theorem, cf. [13, 3.1.16]), the problem of characterizing K^{θ}-compact spaces in Top boils down to a question concerning preservation of products by τ. Hence, we use the terminology and the results of T. Ishii, who studied very carefully and extensively the Tychonoff functor in [24] and [23], and in [25] gave a survey of the results concerning it.

Let $X \in \mathsf{Top}$; $F \subset X$ is a *zero-set* of X if there exists a continuous map $f \colon X \longrightarrow \mathbb{I}$ such that $F = \{x \in X \mid f(x) = 0\}$, and $G \subset X$ is a *cozero-set* of X if there exists a continuous map $g \colon X \longrightarrow \mathbb{I}$ such that $G = \{x \in X \mid g(x) > 0\}$. A subset A of X is τ*-open* if A is a union of cozero-sets of X. (The complement of a τ-open set is called a τ-closed set.) Following T. Ishii, a space X is *w-compact* if for any family $\{P_\lambda\}$ of τ-open subsets of X with the finite intersection property, $\bigcap \bar{P}_\lambda \neq \emptyset$ holds; or equivalently, if for any collection $\{F_\alpha\}$ of closed sets of X that is closed under finite intersections and such that each F_α contains a non-empty cozero-set of X, one has $\bigcap F_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ (cf. [23, 1.4]). Although τX is compact for every w-compact space X (cf. [23, 2.1]), there exists a non-w-compact, regular Hausdorff space X such that τX is compact (cf. [23, 2.3]).

Theorem 3.1. *A space $X \in \mathsf{Top}$ is K^θ-compact if and only if it is w-compact.*

In order to prove Theorem 3.1, we need two results of T. Ishii. Recall that a continuous map $f\colon X \to Y$ of topological spaces is a Z*-map* if $f(Z)$ is closed in Y for every zero-set Z of X.

Fact A. ([23, 2.7], [25, 3.11]) *For a space $X \in \mathsf{Top}$, the following properties are equivalent:*

(i) *X is w-compact;*

(ii) *The projection $\pi_Y\colon X \times Y \to Y$ is a Z-map for every $Y \in \mathsf{Top}$.*

Fact B. ([23, 1.5], [25, 4.1]) *For a space $X \in \mathsf{Top}$, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *for every $x \in X$ there exists a cozero-set W containing x such that $\bar{W}$ is w-compact;*

(ii) *$\tau(X \times Y) = \tau(X) \times \tau(Y)$ for every $Y \in \mathsf{Top}$.*

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1. Suppose that X is K^θ-compact, and let $Y \in \mathsf{Top}$. In order to show that $\pi_Y\colon X \times Y \to Y$ is a Z-map, let $Z \subset X \times Y$ be a zero-set in $X \times Y$. In particular, Z is K^θ-closed in $X \times Y$, and thus $\pi_Y(Z)$ is K^θ-closed in Y, because X is K^θ-compact and K^θ idempotent (Proposition 2.3). Therefore, $\pi_Y(Z)$ is closed in Y, which shows that π_Y is a Z-map. This holds for every $Y \in \mathsf{Top}$, and hence X is w-compact (Fact A).

Conversely, suppose that X is w-compact. Then τ preserves products with X (Fact B, with $W = X$ in (i)). Obviously, $\mathcal{E} = \mathsf{Onto}$ is pullback stable, and thus, by Corollary 2.10, X is K^θ-compact if and only if τX is K-compact. The latter is equivalent to τX being compact, by the classical Kuratowski-Mrówka Theorem (cf. [13, 3.1.16]). Since X is w-compact, τX is compact (cf. [23, 2.1]), and therefore X is K^θ-compact. ☐

We note that if τ preserves products with X (which can be guaranteed by the condition in Fact B), then τX being compact implies that X is K^θ-compact. Therefore, Theorem 3.1 has the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $X \in \mathsf{Top}$ be such that for every $x \in X$ there exists a cozero-set W containing x such that $\bar{W}$ is w-compact. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *X is K^θ-compact;*

(ii) *X is w-compact;*

(iii) *τX is compact.* ☐

4. APPLICATION II: THE BOHR-CLOSURE

Similarly to the relationship between Top and HComp (compact Hausdorff spaces), the full subcategory $\mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{HComp})$ of compact Hausdorff groups is reflective in $\mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{Top})$ (topological groups and their continuous homomorphisms). The reflection is called the *Bohr-compactification*, and is denoted by $\rho_G\colon G \to bG$; ρ_G has a dense image, but it need not be onto. The kernel of ρ_G is denoted by $\mathbf{n}(G)$ and it is called the *von Neumann kernel* of G. There are many groups that do not admit any non-trivial continuous homomorphism into a compact group at all. Such groups are called *minimally almost periodic*, and their Bohr-compactification is trivial (cf. [28]). Therefore, one should not expect ρ_G to be an injection. Those groups G for which $\mathbf{n}(G) = \{e\}$ are called *maximally almost periodic*.

A group G is *precompact* if for every neighborhood U of $e \in G$, there exists a finite subset $F \subset G$ such that $G = FU$. It is interesting to note that while topological spaces X whose Stone-Čech reflection $X \to \beta X$ is an embedding are exactly the Tychonoff spaces, groups G such that ρ_G is an embedding are characterized by being Hausdorff (and thus Tychonoff) and precompact.

Remark 4.1. It follows from the famous Peter-Weyl Theorem that finite-dimensional irreducible unitary representations of a compact Hausdorff group separate its points (cf. [33, Thm. 33]). Every such representation of an abelian group is one dimensional. Thus, for every compact Hausdorff abelian group K and $k \in K$ such that $k \neq 0$, there is $\chi \in \hat{K}$ such that $\chi(k) \neq 0$, where $\hat{K} = \mathscr{H}(K, \mathbb{T})$ is the group of *continuous characters* of K (i.e., continuous homomorphisms $\chi \colon K \to \mathbb{T}$, where $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$). If G is an abelian group, then so is its Bohr-compactification bG (because $\rho_G(G)$ is an abelian dense subgroup of bG). Therefore, $g \in \ker \rho_G$ if and only if $\chi(\rho_G(g)) = 0$ for every $\chi \in \widehat{bG}$. By the universal property of bG, there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\hat{G}$ and $\widehat{bG}$, because $\mathbb{T} \in \mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{HComp})$ - in other words, $\hat{G} = \widehat{bG}$ as sets. Hence, if G is an abelian group, then

$$\mathbf{n}(G) = \bigcap_{\chi \in \hat{G}} \ker \chi. \tag{9}$$

The *Bohr-closure* c_b of a subgroup $S \subseteq G$ is defined as $c_b(S) = \rho_G^{-1}(\overline{\rho_G(S)})$. We equip $\mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{Top})$ with the $(\mathsf{Onto}, \mathsf{Embed})$-factorization system, while $\mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{HComp})$ is provided with the $(\mathsf{Onto}, \mathsf{ClEmb})$-factorization system ($\mathsf{ClEmb}$ stands for the closed embeddings). In this setting, it follows from Proposition 2.2 that c_b is precisely the b-initial lift s^ρ of the discrete closure operator s on $\mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{HComp})$.

Proposition 4.2.

(a) *c_b is idempotent;*

(b) *c_b is productive;*

(c) *$G \in \mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{Top})$ is c_b-separated if and only if ρ_G is injective (i.e., G is maximally almost periodic);*

(d) *$G \in \mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{Top})$ is c_b-compact if and only if ρ_G is surjective.*

PROOF. (a) follows from Proposition 2.3. (b) follows from Proposition 2.4, because the Bohr-compactification preserves products, and surjective maps in $\mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{HComp})$ are productive. (c) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.5, because b is productive and the class of monomorphisms coincides with the injective maps in $\mathsf{Grp}(\mathsf{Top})$. Finally, (d) is a special case of Corollary 2.12. ☐

Let G be a locally compact Hausdorff group. One says that G is *central* if $G/Z(G)$ is compact (cf. [14], [15]); G is a *Moore group* if every irreducible unitary representation of G is finite-dimensional (cf. [27], [36]). Moore groups are automatically maximally almost periodic, because by the Gelfand-Raĭkov Theorem ([18, 22.12]), irreducible representations of a locally compact group separate its points.

Theorem 4.3. *Let G be a locally compact Hausdorff c_b-compact group.*

(a) *If G is Moore, then it is compact.*

(b) *If G is central, then it is compact.*

(c) *If G has nilpotency class ≤ 2, then it is compact.*

(d) *The quotient $G/\overline{[[G,G],G]}$ is compact; in particular, $\mathbf{n}(G) \subseteq \overline{[[G,G],G]}$.*

(e) *Every continuous homomorphism $\alpha\colon G \to \langle \mathbb{R}, + \rangle$ is trivial, and thus G is unimodular.*

Proof. (a) Hughes [19, Theorem 1] & [20, Theorem 1] showed that for a locally compact Hausdorff group G, a subspace $K \subset G$ is compact if and only if K is compact in G^w, the group G equipped with the pointwise topology induced by its irreducible unitary representations. Remus and Trigos-Arrieta [35, Theorem 1] showed that for Moore groups, $G^w = \rho_G(G)$. Since G is c_b-compact, $\rho_G(G) = bG$, and therefore G^w is compact. Hence, by Hughes' result, G is compact. (b) follows from (a), because every central group is Moore (cf. [15, Theorem. 2.1]).

(c) The locally compact abelian group $G_{ab} := G/\overline{[G,G]}$, being the continuous image of G, is c_b-compact. It is also Moore, because every irreducible unitary representation of an abelian group is one dimensional. Thus, by (a), G_{ab} is compact. Since G has nilpotency class 2, one has $[[G,G],G] = 1$, and so $\overline{[G,G]} \subseteq Z(G)$. Therefore, $G/Z(G)$ is a quotient of $G_{ab} = G/\overline{[G,G]}$, and hence G is central. The statement now follows by (b).

(d) follows from (c).

(e) α factors through G_{ab}, which is compact (by (d)), but the only compact subgroup of $\mathbb{R}$ is the trivial one. Therefore, α must be trivial. ☐

A group is *balanced* (or equivalently, *admits an invariant basis*) if its left and right uniformities coincide. A Hausdorff locally compact connected group is balanced if and only if it is central (cf. [14, Theorem 4.3]), which yields:

Corollary 4.4. *Every Hausdorff locally compact connected balanced c_b-compact group is compact.*

One might hope that c_b-compactness "almost" implies compactness, but this is not the case. For instance, every minimally almost periodic group has trivial Bohr-compactification, and in particular, they are c_b-compact. The examples below show that all the conditions in Corollary 4.4 are indeed necessary.

Example 4.5. The special linear group $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a locally compact, connected, and c_b-compact group, which is not compact. Indeed, $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ has the property that its continuous surjective homomorphisms are open - in other words, it is *totally minimal* (cf. [10, 7.4], [34]). In particular, every image of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ is complete, and thus c_b-compact; in particular, $\rho_{SL_2(\mathbb{R})}(SL_2(\mathbb{R}))$ is a complete dense subgroup of $b(SL_2(\mathbb{R}))$, and so $\rho_{SL_2(\mathbb{R})}$ is onto. Therefore, $b(SL_2(\mathbb{R}))$ is a quotient of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$. The only non-trivial quotient of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ is $PSL_2(\mathbb{R})$, which is not compact, because the matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ generates a discrete infinite subgroup. Hence, $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ is minimally almost periodic.

Example 4.6. Nienhuys [29] showed that there exists a coarser metrizable group topology $\mathcal{T}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $G := (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T})$ is minimally almost periodic. Thus, G is c_b-compact, and it is also balanced, because G is abelian. Therefore, G is a balanced, connected, and c_b-compact group, which is not compact.

Van der Waerden proved that every (algebraic) homomorphism from a compact connected semisimple Lie group into a compact group is continuous (cf. [38]). Groups K with this property satisfy $K = b(K_d)$, where K_d is the group K equipped with the discrete topology, and they are called *van der Waerden groups*, or briefly, *vdW-groups* (cf. [16]). For $D = K_d$, one obtains a discrete group that is c_b-compact.

Example 4.7. $SO_3(\mathbb{R})$ is a vdW-group, so $SO_3(\mathbb{R})_d$ is discrete, infinite, and c_b-compact. Thus, $SO_3(\mathbb{R})_d$ is a balanced, locally compact, and c_b-compact group, which is not compact.

A closure operator c is *hereditary* if for every $m\colon M \to A$ in $\operatorname{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} A$ and $n\colon N \to N$ in $\operatorname{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} N$, $c_M(n) = m^{-1}(c_A(n))$; c is *weakly-hereditary* if for every $m\colon M \to A$ in $\operatorname{sub}_{\mathfrak{A}} A$, m is c-dense in the domain of $c_A(m)$.

Theorem 4.8. *The lift c^ρ need not be weakly-hereditary when c is hereditary, even if $\mathfrak{A}$ is $\mathcal{E}$-reflective in $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{E} \cap \operatorname{mor} \mathfrak{A}$.*

Proof. As we mentioned at the beginning of this section, groups whose Bohr-compactification is an embedding are precisely the precompact ones, and for them c_b coincides with the Kuratowski closure. Hausdorff precompact groups form an Onto-reflective subcategory of Grp(Top), and the reflection $G \to b^+G$ is given by the image of G in bG. Therefore, c_b can also be seen as the b^+-initial lift of the hereditary Kuratowski closure operator of the precompact Hausdorff groups. Hence, it suffices to show that c_b is not weakly-hereditary.

The Bohr-closure of the trivial subgroup of a topological group G is simply its von Neumann kernel, $\mathbf{n}(G)$. Had c_b been weakly-hereditary, then

$$\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{n}(G)) = (c_b)_{\mathbf{n}(G)}(\{e\}) = (c_b)_G(\{e\}) = \mathbf{n}(G) \tag{10}$$

would have been true for every topological group G, but this is not the case, as the Example 4.9 shows. □

The example below was suggested by Dikran Dikranjan.

Example 4.9. For a prime number $p \neq 2$, let $A = Z(p^\infty)$, the Prüfer group. It can be seen as the subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ generated by the elements of p-power order, or the group formed by all p^nth roots of unity. Since every proper subgroup of A is finite, if A is equipped with a Hausdorff group topology in which it is not minimally almost periodic (in other words, $\mathbf{n}(A) \neq A$), then $\mathbf{n}(A)$ is a finite subgroup with the discrete topology, and thus $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{n}(A))$ is trivial. Therefore, if τ is a Hausdorff group topology on A such that (A, τ) is neither minimally nor maximally almost periodic, then $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{n}(A, \tau)) \neq \mathbf{n}(A, \tau)$.

Following Zelenyuk and Protasov [40], a sequence $\{a_n\} \subseteq G$ in a (discrete) abelian group G is said to be a T-*sequence* if there is a Hausdorff group topology τ on A such that $a_n \xrightarrow{\tau} 0$. It follows from the proof of [40, Theorem 1] that if $\{a_n\}$ is a T-sequence and τ is the finest group topology such that $a_n \xrightarrow{\tau} 0$, then (G,τ) is universal in the following sense: a homomorphism $\varphi\colon G\{a_n\} \to H$ into a topological group H is continuous if and only if $\varphi(a_n) \to 0$.

Let $c_n = \frac{1}{p^n}$ in A, put

$$b_n = -c_1 + c_{n^3-n^2} + \cdots + c_{n^3-2n} + c_{n^3-n} + c_{n^3} = -\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p^{n^3-n^2}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p^{n^3-2n}} + \frac{1}{p^{n^3-n}} + \frac{1}{p^{n^3}}, \quad (11)$$

and consider the sequence a_n defined as $b_1, c_1, b_2, c_2, b_3, c_3, \ldots$. One can show that $\{a_n\}$ is a T-sequence in A; we chose to omit the proof of this statement because of its technical nature and length. We set τ to be the finest Hausdorff group topology on A such that $a_n \to 0$ in τ, and apply (9) from Remark 4.1 to show that $\mathbf{n}(A,\tau) = \langle \frac{1}{p} \rangle$.

To that end, let $\chi \in \widehat{(A,\tau)}$; then $\chi(a_n) \to 0$, and in particular, $\chi(c_n) \to 0$. By [40, Example 6] and [9, 3.3], $\chi(c_n) \to 0$ is equivalent to $\chi = m\chi_1$, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and χ_1 is the natural embedding of $\mathbb{Z}(p^\infty)$ into $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. It is easily seen that $\chi_1(b_n) = -\frac{1}{p}$. Thus, if $\chi(b_n) \to 0$, then $-m\frac{1}{p} = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, and so $p \mid m$. On the other hand, it follows from $p\chi_1(b_n) \to -p\frac{1}{p} = 0$ that $p\chi_1(a_n) \to 0$, so $p\chi_1$ is continuous with respect to τ. Therefore, $\widehat{(A,\tau)} = \{m\chi_1 \mid m \in p\mathbb{Z}\}$. Hence, $\langle \frac{1}{p} \rangle \subseteq \ker\chi$ for every $\chi \in \widehat{(A,\tau)}$. Since $\ker p\chi_1 = \langle \frac{1}{p} \rangle$, this shows that $\mathbf{n}(A,\tau) = \langle \frac{1}{p} \rangle$, as desired.

5. APPLICATION III: THE $*$-REPRESENTATION TOPOLOGY

A *$*$-algebra* A is an algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ with an involution ${}^*\colon A \to A$ such that $(a+\lambda b)^* = a^* + \bar{\lambda} b^*$ and $(ab)^* = b^* a^*$ for every $a,b \in A$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. A *topological $*$-algebra* is a $*$-algebra A and a topology on A making the operations (addition, multiplication, additive inverse, involution) jointly continuous. The category of topological $*$-algebras and their continuous $*$-homomorphisms is denoted by $\mathsf{T^*A}$. A *C^*-[semi]norm* on a $*$-algebra A is a [semi]norm p that is submultiplicative and satisfies the C^*-identity - in other words, $p(ab) \leq p(a)p(b)$ and $p(a^*a) = p(a)^2$ for every $a,b \in A$. We put $\mathcal{N}(A)$ for the set of continuous C^*-seminorms on a topological $*$-algebra A. For every $p,q \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, one has $\max\{p,q\} \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ ($\max\{p,q\}$ is defined pointwise), which turns $\mathcal{N}(A)$ into a directed set.

A *C^*-algebra* is a complete Hausdorff topological algebra whose topology is given by a single C^*-norm. The full subcategory of $\mathsf{T^*A}$ formed by the C^*-algebras is denoted by $\mathsf{C^*A}$. For $A \in \mathsf{T^*A}$, a *$*$-representation* of A is a continuous $*$-homomorphism $\pi\colon A \to B(H)$ of A into the C^*-algebra of bounded operators on some Hilbert space H (i.e., a morphism in $\mathsf{T^*A}$). The class of $*$-representations of A is denoted by $\mathcal{R}(A)$.

Let $p \in \mathcal{N}(A)$; $\ker p = \{a \in A \mid p(a) = 0\}$ is a $*$-ideal in A, and p induces a C^*-norm on the quotient $A/\ker p$, so the completion A_p of this quotient with respect to p is a C^*-algebra. By the celebrated Gelfand-Naĭmark-Segal theorem, every C^*-algebra is $*$-isomorphic (and thus isometric) to a closed subalgebra of $B(H)$ for a large enough Hilbert space H (cf. [11, 2.6.1]). Thus, we obtain a $*$-representation $\pi_p\colon A \to A/\ker p \to A_p \to B(H)$ such that $p(x) = \|\pi_p(x)\|$. Conversely, each $\pi \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ gives rise to a C^*-seminorm $p_\pi(x) = \|\pi(x)\|$. Therefore, the initial topology $\mathcal{T}_A$ induced by the class $\mathcal{R}(A)$ coincides with the one induces by the family of C^*-seminorms $\mathcal{N}(A)$. The topology $\mathcal{T}_A$ is called the *$*$-representation topology*, and it defines a closure operator c^* on subalgebras in $\mathsf{T^*A}$. The closure $c^*_A(\{0\})$ of the trivial subalgebra is a closed $*$-ideal of A; it is called the *reducing ideal* of A, and denoted by A_R (cf. [30, 9.7]). Notice that

$$c^*_A(\{0\}) = A_R = \bigcap_{p \in \mathcal{N}(A)} \ker p = \bigcap_{\pi \in \mathcal{R}(A)} \ker \pi, \tag{12}$$

so $\mathcal{T}_A$ is Hausdorff (i.e., $A_R = 0$) if and only if the $*$-representations of A separate the points of A.

A topological $*$-algebra A is said to be a *pro-C^*-algebra* if it is Hausdorff, complete, and its topology is generated by a family of C^*-seminorms - in other words, the topology of A coincides with $\mathcal{T}_A$, it is complete, and $A_R = 0$. One can show that A is a pro-C^*-algebra if and only if A is the limit in $\mathsf{T^*A}$ of C^*-algebras (cf. [32, 1.1.1]). The full subcategory of $\mathsf{T^*A}$ consisting of pro-C^*-algebras is denoted by $\overline{\mathsf{P^*A}}$. These algebras were studied under various names (locally C^*-algebras, LMC*-algebras, etc.) by numerous authors; for instance, in section 3 of [12], Dubuc and Porta essentially characterized commutative pro-C^*-algebras (up to a k-ification). Alluding only to a few more highlights, we mention the works of Inoue [21], Schmüdgen [37], Phillips [31] & [32], Bhatt and Karia [2], and Inoue and Kürsten [22].

Proposition 5.1. *$\overline{\mathsf{P^*A}}$ is a reflective subcategory of $\mathsf{T^*A}$.*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathsf{T^*A}$. For each $p \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, we put A_p to be the completion of $A/\ker p$ with respect to the C^*-norm that p induces on it; obviously, A_p is a C^*-algebra. For every $q \geq p$ in the directed set $\mathcal{N}(A)$, there is a surjective morphism $A_q \to A_p$. This defines a functor

$$A_*\colon \mathcal{N}(A) \longrightarrow \mathsf{C^*A} \subset \mathsf{T^*A} \tag{13}$$

$$p \longmapsto A_p, \tag{14}$$

and so we define the reflector

$$\overline{PC^*}(A) = \lim A_*, \tag{15}$$

where the limit is taken in $\mathsf{T^*A}$. It follows from the definition that $\overline{PC^*}(A)$ is a pro-C^*-algebra.

To show that $\overline{PC^*}(-)\colon \mathsf{T^*A} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathsf{P^*A}}$ is a functor, let $\varphi\colon A \to B$ be a morphism in $\mathsf{T^*A}$. Then $\mathcal{N}(\varphi)\colon \mathcal{N}(B) \to \mathcal{N}(A)$ defined by $r \mapsto r\varphi$ is an order-preserving map, and $\varphi_r\colon A_{r\varphi} \to B_r$ is a natural transformation from $A_*\mathcal{N}(\varphi)$ to B_*. Thus, there is a morphism $\lim A_*\mathcal{N}(\varphi) \to \lim B_*$, and therefore one sets $\overline{PC^*}(\varphi) = (\lim A_* \to \lim A_*\mathcal{N}(\varphi) \to \lim B_*)$.

To complete the proof, one defines $\eta_A\colon A \to \overline{PC^*}(A)$ by setting $\eta_A(x) = (x + \ker p)_{p \in \mathcal{N}(A)}$. Obviously, η_A is a morphism (because each $A \to A_p$ is so), and it is a natural transformation. Let $x = (x_p)_{p \in \mathcal{N}(A)} \in \overline{PC^*}(A)$, and pick $p_1, \ldots, p_k \in \mathcal{N}(A)$. Then $q = \max\{p_1, \ldots, p_k\} \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, and $A_q \to A_{p_i}$ is surjective. The image of A under the canonical morphism $A \to A_q$ is dense, so for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $a \in A$ such that $q(\bar{a}_q - x_q) < \varepsilon$, and thus $p_i(\bar{a}_{p_i} - x_{p_i}) < \varepsilon$ (where $\bar{a}_p$ stands for the image of a in A_p). Therefore, the image $\eta_A(A)$ is dense in $\overline{PC^*}(A)$. If $B \in \overline{\mathsf{P^*A}}$, then $\eta_B = \mathrm{id}_B$. Hence, if $\varphi\colon A \to B$ is a morphism from $A \in \mathsf{T^*A}$ into $B \in \overline{\mathsf{P^*A}}$, then $\varphi = \eta_B\varphi = \overline{PC^*}(\varphi)\eta_A$. This decomposition is unique, because $\eta_A(A)$ is dense in $\overline{PC^*}(A)$. $\square$

We turn now to fitting all these into the setting of section 2. Equip $\mathfrak{X} = \mathsf{T^*A}$ with the usual $(\mathsf{Onto}, \mathsf{Embed})$-factorization system, and provide $\mathfrak{A} = \overline{\mathsf{P^*A}}$ with the $(\mathsf{Dense}, \mathsf{ClEmb})$-factorization system ($\mathsf{Dense}$ and ClEmb stand for the maps with a dense image and closed embeddings, respectively). The Onto-reflective hull of $\mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathfrak{X}$ is the category $\mathfrak{B} = \mathsf{P^*A}$ consisting of the algebras $A \in \mathsf{T^*A}$ such that $A_R = 0$ and $\mathcal{T}_A$ coincides with the topology of A; the reflector PC^* is given by $A \longmapsto \eta_A(A)$, and the reflection $\alpha_A \colon A \to PC^*(A)$ is the same as η, but with different codomain. The category $\mathfrak{B}$ inherits the $(\mathsf{Onto}, \mathsf{Embed})$-factorization system of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Theorem 5.2.

(a) $c^* = K^\alpha = K^\eta$*, in other words, the* $*$*-representation topology is the* PC^**-initial* [$\overline{PC^*}$*-initial*] *lift of the Kuratowski closure* K *on* $\mathsf{P^*A}$ [$\overline{\mathsf{P^*A}}$].

(b) c^* *is finitely productive.*

(c) *An algebra* $A \in \mathsf{T^*A}$ *is* c^**-separated if and only if* α_A *is injective, or equivalently,* $A_R = 0$*; in particular, each algebra in* $\mathsf{P^*A}$ *is* c^**-separated.*

(d) *An algebra* $A \in \mathsf{T^*A}$ *is* c^**-compact in* $\mathsf{T^*A}$ *if and only if* $PC^*(A)$ *is* K*-compact in* $\mathsf{P^*A}$*; in this case,* η_A *is surjective.*

PROOF. (a) It follows from the definition that $\mathcal{T}_A$ is the initial topology on A induced by the family of *-homomorphisms $(A \to A_p)_{p \in \mathcal{N}(A)}$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{T}_A$ is the initial topology induced by the single *-homomorphism $A \to \prod\limits_{p \in \mathcal{N}(A)} A_p$, whose image is contained in $PC^*(A) \subseteq \overline{PC^*}(A)$. Therefore, the statement follows from Proposition 2.2.

(b) Since $PC^*(-)$ is additive, it preserves finite products in $\mathsf{T^*A}$. Therefore, the statement follows from Proposition 2.4, as K is productive, and surjective morphisms in $\mathsf{P^*A}$ are productive.

(c) follows from Proposition 2.5, because $PC^*(-)$ preserves finite products, and monomorphism in $\mathsf{T^*A}$ are injections.

(d) It would be tempting to apply Theorem 2.7 to $\mathfrak{A}$, but unfortunately, the condition of $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$ fails: in our case, $\mathcal{F} = \mathsf{Dense}$ in $\overline{\mathsf{P^*A}}$ while $\mathcal{E} = \mathsf{Onto}$. Instead, we apply Corollary 2.10 to $\mathcal{B} = \mathsf{P^*A}$ in order to obtain the first statement, while the second one is a consequence of Proposition 2.6(b). ☐

To conclude, we investigate the class of topological $*$-algebras whose $*$-representation topology is generated by a single continuous seminorm. As the next lemma (which is modeled on [30, 10.1.7]) reveals, these are precisely the algebras for which $\overline{PC^*}(A)$ is a C^*-algebra.

Lemma 5.3. *Let* $A \in \mathsf{T^*A}$*. The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *For every* $x \in A$*,*

$$\gamma(x) = \sup\{p(x) \mid p \in \mathcal{N}(A)\} = \{\|\pi(x)\| \mid \pi \in \mathcal{R}(A)\} < \infty, \tag{16}$$

and γ *is continuous on* A*;*

(ii) $\mathcal{N}(A)$ *has a largest element;*

(iii) $\overline{PC^*}(A)$ *is a* C^**-algebra;*

(iv) $\mathcal{T}_A$ *is defined by a single continuous linear space seminorm on* A*.*

Remark 5.4. The seminorm in (iv) is not assumed *a priori* to be submultiplicative or a C^*-seminorm.

PROOF. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Since each $p \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ is a C^*-seminorms, so is γ, which (being continuous) belongs to $\mathcal{N}(A)$. Thus, γ is the largest element of $\mathcal{N}(A)$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) Let $r \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ be the largest element. Then A_r is a C^*-algebra, and for each $p \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ there is a morphism $A_r \to A_p$. Thus, $\overline{PC^*}(A) = \lim A_* = A_r$ is a C^*-algebra.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv) Let $\| \cdot \|$ be the norm of the C^*-algebra $\overline{PC^*}(A)$. It is certainly a C^*-seminorm on A, and by definition, it defines $\mathcal{T}_A$. In particular, $\| \cdot \|$ is continuous.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Let σ be a seminorm that defines $\mathcal{T}_A$. Since multiplication is jointly continuous in $PC^*(A)$ (which carries the quotient topology $\mathcal{T}_A/A_R$), there is a constant $B > 0$ such that $\sigma(xy) \leq B\sigma(x)\sigma(y)$ for every $x, y \in A$. Thus, by replacing σ with $B\sigma$ if necessary, we may assume that $B = 1$ and σ is submultiplicative. Let $\pi\colon A \to B(H) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Pick $a \in A$. Since $B(H)$ is a C^*-algebra,

$$\|\pi(a)\|^2 = \|\pi(a^*a)\| = r_{B(H)}(\pi(a^*a)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|(\pi(a^*a))^n\|^{\frac{1}{n}}. \tag{17}$$

By the continuity of π with respect to $\mathcal{T}_A$, there is a constant C_π such that $\|\pi(x)\| \leq C_\pi\sigma(x)$ for every $x \in A$, so

$$\|(\pi(a^*a))^n\|^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \sqrt[n]{C_\pi}\sigma((a^*a)^n)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \sqrt[n]{C_\pi}\sigma(a^*a). \tag{18}$$

Therefore,

$$\|\pi(a)\|^2 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|(\pi(a^*a))^n\|^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{C_\pi}\sigma(a^*a) = \sigma(a^*a) \leq D\sigma(a)^2, \tag{19}$$

where D is a constant such that $\sigma(x^*) \leq A\sigma(x)$ for every $x \in A$. Hence, $\gamma(a) \leq \sqrt{D}\sigma(a)$, which proves the second statement too, because σ is assumed to be continuous on A. ☐

Palmer [30, 10.1] investigated discrete $*$-algebras that satisfied the equivalent conditions of Lemma 5.3, and named them *G^*-algebras*. Thus, we extend this terminology to topological $*$-algebras too, and denote by $\mathsf{G^*A}$ the full subcategory of $\mathsf{T^*A}$ formed by the (generalized) G^*-algebras. For $A \in \mathsf{G^*A}$, we put $C^*(A)$ for $\overline{PC^*}(A)$, and call it the *enveloping C^*-algebra* of A. The next Proposition is a consequence of Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.3; its restricted version, for discrete G^*-algebras, appears in [30, 10.1.11].

Proposition 5.5. *The category* $\mathsf{C^*A}$ *is a full reflective subcategory of* $\mathsf{G^*A}$*, and its reflector is given by* $A \longmapsto C^*(A)$*.* ☐

We once again return to the setting of section 2. Equip $\mathfrak{X} = \mathsf{G^*A}$ with the $(\mathsf{Onto}, \mathsf{Embed})$-factorization system, and provide $\mathfrak{A} = \mathsf{C^*A}$ with the $(\mathsf{Onto}, \mathsf{Inj})$-factorization system ($\mathsf{Inj}$ stands for injections). Notice that every injection of C^*-algebras is actually an embedding (cf. [11, 1.8.1]), so the Kuratowski closure on C^*-subalgebras of C^*-algebras is just the discrete closure s. (This is not too surprising, though, because van Osdol [39] showed that the category of unital C^*-algebras and their unital $*$-homomorphisms is monadic over Set.) Therefore, by Corollary 2.12, we get:

Theorem 5.6. *An algebra* $A \in \mathsf{G^*A}$ *is c^*-compact if and only if* $\alpha_A\colon A \to C^*(A)$ *is surjective.* ☐

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Professor Walter Tholen, my PhD supervisor, who introduced me to the concept of closure operators, for his attention to this work and his helpful suggestions.

I am grateful to Professor Dikran Dikranjan, whose talk at CITA-2003 was the main source of inspiration for this research, for his sharp and constructive criticism of my early notes for the paper, and for numerous valuable suggestions at the later stages.

I wish to thank Professor Salvador Hernández, Professor Maria Manuel Clementino, and Professor Bob Paré for the valuable discussions that were of great assistance in writing this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Baron. Reflectors as compositions of epi-reflectors. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 136:499–508, 1969.

[2] Subhash J. Bhatt and Dinesh J. Karia. An intrinsic characterization of Pro-C^*-algebras and its applications. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 175(1):68–80, 1993.

[3] M. M. Clementino, E. Giuli, and W. Tholen. Topology in a category: compactness. *Portugal. Math.*, 53(4):397–433, 1996.

[4] M. M. Clementino, E. Giuli, and W. Tholen. A functional approach to general topology. In M. C. Pedicchio and W. Tholen, editors, *Categorical Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[5] D. Dikranjan and W. Tholen. *Categorical structure of closure operators*, volume 346 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1995. With applications to topology, algebra and discrete mathematics.

[6] Dikran Dikranjan and Eraldo Giuli. Closure operators. I. In *Proceedings of the 8th international conference on categorical topology (L'Aquila, 1986)*, volume 27, pages 129–143, 1987.

[7] Dikran Dikranjan and Eraldo Giuli. Compactness, minimality and closedness with respect to a closure operator. In *Categorical topology and its relation to analysis, algebra and combinatorics (Prague, 1988)*, pages 284–296. World Sci. Publishing, Teaneck, NJ, 1989.

[8] Dikran Dikranjan, Eraldo Giuli, and Walter Tholen. Closure operators. II. In *Categorical topology and its relation to analysis, algebra and combinatorics (Prague, 1988)*, pages 297–335. World Sci. Publishing, Teaneck, NJ, 1989.

[9] Dikran Dikranjan, Chiara Milan, and Albert Tonolo. A characterization of the maximally almost periodic abelian groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, to appear.

[10] Dikran N. Dikranjan, Ivan R. Prodanov, and Luchezar N. Stoyanov. *Topological groups*, volume 130 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1990. Characters, dualities and minimal group topologies.

[11] Jacques Dixmier. *C^*-algebras*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1977. Translated from the French by Francis Jellett, North-Holland Mathematical Library, Vol. 15.

[12] Eduardo J. Dubuc and Horacio Porta. Convenient categories of topological algebras, and their duality theory. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 1(3):281–316, 1971.

[13] Ryszard Engelking. *General topology*, volume 6 of *Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics*. Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1989. Translated from the Polish by the author.

[14] Siegfried Grosser and Martin Moskowitz. On central topological groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 127:317–340, 1967.

[15] Siegfried Grosser and Martin Moskowitz. Representation theory of central topological groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 129:361–390, 1967.

[16] Joan E. Hart and Kenneth Kunen. Bohr Compactifications of Non-Abeilan Groups. *Topology Proc.*, 26(2):593–626, 2001/02.

[17] Horst Herrlich. *Topologische Reflexionen und Coreflexionen*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 78. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1968.

[18] Edwin Hewitt and Kenneth A. Ross. *Abstract harmonic analysis.* Academic Press Inc., Publishers, New York, 1963.

[19] Ralph Hughes. *Weak compactnes and topological groups*. PhD thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1972.

[20] Ralph Hughes. Compactness in locally compact groups. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 79:122–123, 1973.

[21] Atsushi Inoue. Locally C^*-algebra. *Mem. Fac. Sci. Kyushu Univ. Ser. A*, 25:197–235, 1971.

[22] Atsushi Inoue and Klaus-Detlef Kürsten. On C^*-like locally convex $*$-algebras. *Math. Nachr.*, 235:51–58, 2002.

[23] Tadashi Ishii. On the Tychonoff functor and w-compactness. *Topology Appl.*, 11(2):173–187, 1980.

[24] Tadashi Ishii. On the Tychonoff functor and k-spaces. *Questions Answers Gen. Topology*, 7(2):129–133, 1989.

[25] Tadashi Ishii. The Tychonoff functor and related topics. In *Topics in general topology*, pages 203–243. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.

[26] George Janelidze and Walter Tholen. Facets of descent. I. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 2(3):245–281, 1994.

[27] Calvin C. Moore. Groups with finite dimensional irreducible representations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 166:401–410, 1972.

[28] J. Neumann and E. P. Wigner. Minimally almost periodic groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 41:746–750, 1940.

[29] J. W. Nienhuys. A solenoidal and monothetic minimally almost periodic group. *Fund. Math.*, 73(2):167–169, 1971/72.

[30] Theodore W. Palmer. *Banach algebras and the general theory of $*$-algebras. Vol. 2*, volume 79 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001. $*$-algebras.

[31] N. Christopher Phillips. Inverse limits of C^*-algebras. *J. Operator Theory*, 19(1):159–195, 1988.

[32] N. Christopher Phillips. Inverse limits of C^*-algebras and applications. In *Operator algebras and applications, Vol. 1*, volume 135 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 127–185. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1988.

[33] L. S. Pontryagin. *Selected works. Vol. 2*. Gordon & Breach Science Publishers, New York, third edition, 1986. Topological groups, Edited and with a preface by R. V. Gamkrelidze, Translated from the Russian and with a preface by Arlen Brown, With additional material translated by P. S. V. Naidu.

[34] Dieter Remus and Luchezar Stojanov. Complete minimal and totally minimal groups. *Topology Appl.*, 42(1):57–69, 1991.

[35] Dieter Remus and F. Javier Trigos-Arrieta. The Bohr topology of Moore groups. *Topology Appl.*, 97(1-2):85–98, 1999. Special issue in honor of W. W. Comfort (Curacao, 1996).

[36] Lewis C. Robertson. A note on the structure of Moore groups. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 75:594–599, 1969.

[37] Konrad Schmüdgen. Über LMC-Algebren. *Math. Nachr.*, 68:167–182, 1975.

[38] B.L. van der Waerden. Stetigkeitsstze fr halbeinfache Liesche Gruppen. *Math. Z.*, 36:780–786, 1933.

[39] D. H. Van Osdol. C^*-algebras and cohomology. In *Categorical topology (Toledo, Ohio, 1983)*, volume 5 of *Sigma Ser. Pure Math.*, pages 582–587. Heldermann, Berlin, 1984.

[40] E. G. Zelenyuk and I. V. Protasov. Topologies on abelian groups. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 54(5):1090–1107, 1990.

FB 3 - Mathematik und Informatik
Universität Bremen
Bibliothekstrasse 1
28359 Bremen
Germany

Current address:
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Dalhousie University
Halifax, B3H 3J5, Nova Scotia
Canada

e-mail: lukacs@mathstat.yorku.ca